

REMARKS

Currently, Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, and 14 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the language of Claim 14 to make its meaning clearer. In particular, line 2 has been modified to read, "patterning the resist to expose a seed layer over the surface of the wafer". Line 3 has also been modified to read "forming a plurality of conductors over the exposed seed layer." Applicant believes that this amendment has clarified the meaning of Claim 14 without narrowing the scope of the claim. As a result of this amendment to Claim 14, applicant believes that dependent Claim 15 has also become clear.

Claims 1-12 have been rejected in view of prior art, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (US 2002/0093082 A1) in view of Klocke et al. (US 2003/0079989 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

By amending Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. In particular, Claim 1 now recites "forming a layer of conductive material over the protruding 3D structures; [and] placing the non-planar surface, including the layer of conductive material, into an electrophoretic resist." It is respectfully submitted that the references of record do not teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable over the references.

Claims 2-12 each depend from Claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding additional limitations.

Claims 13-22 have been rejected in view of prior art, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Britzinger et al. (US 2004/0087131 A1) in view of Klocke et al. (US 2003/0079989 A1). However, Applicant has filed a Statement of Common Ownership stating that, at the time the invention of present application was made, both the present application and the Britzinger application were owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment, to a common assignee. As a result, Britzinger is not a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Since the rejection of each of claims 13-22 relied upon Britzinger, each of these claims is allowable.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

August 30, 2005

Date



Ira S. Matsil
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,272

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252-5793
Tel. 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218